



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/071,945	02/05/2002	Max Schireson	ORCL-2000-136-01	3623

7590 05/18/2005

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

CHEUNG, MARY DA ZHI WANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/071,945

Applicant(s)

SCHIRESON, MAX

Examiner

Mary Cheung

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

EA

M

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on February 22, 2005. Claims 1-21 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed February 22, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Bezo (U. S. Patent 6,029,141) teaches "freely modify its product offering without the need for involving the merchant by simply updating product descriptions and corresponding referral links within the catalog", that is different from selecting an item as it is actually displayed on a web page and immediately editing the item on that web page. Examiner respectfully disagrees because Bezo's freely modification of the product offering does not eliminate the ability of allowing the associates to use the Internet to perform the modification process (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21 and Figs. 1-2).

The applicant further argues that Bezo's teaching does not need the user to consult any catalog or other paper-based or non-paper-based information source. Examiner believes this teaching does not contradict updating and verifying the edited item as claimed by the applicant because verification of the associates' edited data entry may be needed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezo et al., U. S. Patent 6,029,141 in view of Dabney et al., U. S. Patent 6,643,663.

As to claims 1, 8 and 15, Bezo teaches a method, an apparatus, and a computer readable media having computer readable instructions for implementing an e-commerce storefront management user interface to enable efficient updating of the Web pages of the storefront, comprising (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21):

- a) Accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21);
- b) Submitting log in information to the Web site (Appendix A of column 16 – column 17);
- c) Selecting an item on the Web page to modify (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21);
- d) Editing the item on the Web page (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21);
- e) Submitting the edited item to the Web site (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21);

Art Unit: 3621

f) Receiving an updated version of the Web page to view (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21).

Bezo does not specifically teach verifying the edited item. However, Dabney teaches receiving an updated version of content and verify the edit item (column 5 lines 31-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow Bezo's teaching to include verifying the edited item as enunciated by Dabney for ensuring the quality of the edited item.

As to claims 2, 9 and 16, Bezo teaches logging into the Web site with an authentication to obtain privileges for modifying Web pages of the Web site (Appendix A of column 16 – column 17).

As to claims 3, 10 and 17, Bezo modified by Dabney teaches receiving updated version of the Web page to view and verify the edit item as discussed above. Bezo modified by Dabney does not specifically teach logging out the Web site prior to receiving the updated version of the Web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow the teaching of Bezo modified by Dabney to include the feature of logging out the Web site prior to receiving the updated version of the Web page for reducing the conflict between the modification and updating of the web content.

As to claims 4, 11 and 18, Bezo teaches the steps a) through f) of claims 1, 8 and 15 are performed with a web browser on a client machine (column 8 line 49 – column 9 line 21 and Appendix A of column 16 – column 17).

As to claims 5, 12 and 19, Bezo modified by Dabney teaches viewing the updated version of the Web page using a web browser on a client machine to verify the

Art Unit: 3621

appearance of the edited item as discussed above (see claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15 and 18 above). Bezo modified by Dabney does not specifically teach the appearance being the same as the appearance to a standard user accessing the updated version of the Web page. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow Bezo modified by Dabney to include the feature of verifying the verifying the appearance of the edited item being the same as the appearance to a standard user accessing the updated version of the Web page for ensuring the quality of the edited item.

As to claims 7, 14 and 21, Bezo does not specifically teach generating workflow notification to request an approval of the updated version of the Web page, wherein the updated version of the Web page is not provided until the approval is obtained.

However, this matter is taught by Dabney receiving the new edited content for approval and receiving a notification for the content being approved before dissemination (column 5 lines 31-43 and column 15 lines 26-54). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow Bezo's teaching to include the feature of generating workflow notification to request an approval of the updated version of the Web page, wherein the updated version of the Web page is not provided until the approval is obtained as taught by Dabney for ensuring the quality of the edited content.

5. Claims 6, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezo et al., U. S. Patent 6,029,141 in view of Dabney et al., U. S. Patent 6,643,663 in further view of Immerman et al., U. S. Patent 6,785,721.

As to claims 6, 13 and 20, Bezo modified by Dabney teaches submitting log in information to Web page as discussed above. Bezo modified by Dabney does not specifically teach submitting a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web page and submitting a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web page, wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level for modifying a greater number of items of the Web page than the first privilege level. However, this matter is taught by Immerman as an access control list that specifies the level of access users and servers, and the administrator can specify an access level, access level privileges for each user name and server name (column 19 line 66 – column 20 line 21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to allow the teaching of Bezo modified by Dabney to include multiple privilege levels of access for securely controlling the content of the Web page.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3621

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquire

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mary Cheung whose telephone number is 571-272-6705. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (10:00-7:30) Second Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mary Cheung
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3621
May 16, 2005



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600